



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,241	01/14/2002	Matthias Bratz	42044 Cont.	1890
26474	7590	03/02/2004	EXAMINER	
KEIL & WEINKAUF 1350 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Communication Re: Appeal	Application No. 10/043,241	Applicant(s) BRATZ ET AL.
	Examiner Sabiha N. Qazi	Art Unit 1616


-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The Notice of Appeal filed on _____ is not acceptable because:
- (a) ☐ it was not timely filed.
 - (b) ☐ the statutory fee for filing the appeal was not submitted. See 37 CFR 1.17(b).
 - (c) ☐ the appeal fee received on _____ was not timely filed.
 - (d) ☐ the submitted fee of \$_____ is insufficient. The appeal fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(b) is \$_____.
 - (e) ☐ the appeal is not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.191 in that there is no record of a second or a final rejection in this application.
 - (f) ☐ a Notice of Allowability, PTO-37, was mailed by the Office on _____.

2. ☒ The appeal brief filed on 12/1/03 is NOT acceptable for the reason(s) indicated below:
- (a) ☒ the brief and/or brief fee is untimely. See 37 CFR 1.192.
 - (b) ☐ the statutory fee for filing the brief has not been submitted. See 37 CFR 1.17(c).
 - (c) ☐ the submitted brief fee of \$_____ is insufficient. The brief fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(c) is \$_____.

The appeal in this application will be dismissed unless corrective action is taken to timely submit the brief and requisite fee. Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a).

3. ☐ The appeal in this application is DISMISSED because:
- (a) ☐ the statutory fee for filing the brief as required under 37 CFR 1.17(c) was not timely submitted and the period for obtaining an extension of time to file the brief under 37 CFR 1.136 has expired.
 - (b) ☐ the brief was not timely filed and the period for obtaining an extension of time to file the brief under 37 CFR 1.136 has expired.
 - (c) ☐ Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed on _____.
 - (d) ☐ other: _____
4. ☐ Because of the dismissal of the appeal, this application:
- (a) ☐ is abandoned because there are no allowed claims.
 - (b) ☐ is before the examiner for final disposition because it contains allowed claims. Prosecution on the merits remains CLOSED.
 - (c) ☐ is before the examiner for consideration of the submission and prosecution has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.


Sabiha N. Qazi
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1616

Defective Appeal Brief

1. Acknowledgement is made of the Appeal Brief filed on 12/1/03. Claims 10-18 are pending. No claim is allowed.

Appeal brief is defective because claims stand rejected on statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting which a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome this rejection. No response has been filed for 101 Double Patenting rejection.

2. Rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

3. A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-9 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,482,772. This is a double patenting rejection. Presently claimed invention is drawn to a solid mixture of sulfonylurea and an alkylpolyglycoside, their preparation and method of use for controlling undesirable plant growth, same invention is claimed in US '772.

5. Examiner notes a typing error in claim 11. See the definition of R19, line 2 where "---halogen atom. Furthermore, ----", a (.) after halogen should be removed.

Rejection under 103 is withdrawn. Mr. Jason Voight agreed to cancel the claim 18, which is independent and is not a solid mixture (See interview summary).

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha N. Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sabiha N. Qazi
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1616
